

Remarks

I. Introduction

This is in response to the final Office Action dated August 11, 2010. In response to the finality of the Office Action applicants submit a Request for Continued Examination herewith.

The Office Action rejected claims 13 and 22 based on U.S. Patent No. 6,601,679 to Crenella et al. ("Crenella") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0183008 to Menard et al ("Menard").

Claims 14-21, 23-27 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Crenella in view of Menard and U.S. Patent No. 5,850,416 to Robert Myer ("Myer").

Claims 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crenella in view of Menard, and in further view of Myer and U.S. Patent No. 6,209,480 to Mehrdad Moslehi ("Moslehi").

Claims 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crenella in view of Menard, and in further view of Myer and U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0024460 to Ghosh et al. ("Ghosh").

In response, Applicants have amended claims 13, 14, 17, 27, and 28 and added new claims 34 and 35. Claims 1-12 were previously cancelled. Claims 13-35 remain for consideration.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Independent claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Crenella in view of Menard.

In order to “establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). Furthermore, “all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). See also MPEP § 2143.03. The cited references, separately or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of independent claim 13. Therefore, Applicants request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The present invention relates generally to information technologies and more specifically to a device for remote reading of states comprising a communication network and a plurality of peripherals, each of which adopts an instantaneous state. The device also includes a controller periodically scanning the peripherals to read the instantaneous state of the peripherals. The communication network electromagnetically connects the peripherals to the controller, and the peripherals are supplied with electrical energy via the communication network. Figure 3 illustrates one embodiment in which each loop of a plurality of inductive loops 11, 12, 13 of communication network 1 is associated with one of local antennas 401, 402, 403 connected to one of corresponding peripheral devices 31, 32, 33. The invention is useful for managing calls in elevators by means of peripherals not provided with any galvanic connection or individual power source, and thereby provides significant advantages by reducing the cost and complexity of providing an elevator installation.

Independent claim 13 pertains to a system for remote status readings comprising a communication network comprising a plurality of electromagnetic induction loops and includes the limitation of “each of the plurality of peripheral devices associated with a respective one of the plurality of electromagnetic induction loops.” The cited references, separately or in combination, do not disclose these limitations.

Applicants note that the claim 13 limitation of “each of the plurality of peripheral devices associated with a respective one of the plurality of electromagnetic induction loops” is similar to a limitation previously contained in dependent claim 14 which was

rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Crenella in view of Menard in further view of Myer. However, the cited references, separately or in combination, do not teach or suggest the limitation of “each of the plurality of peripheral devices associated with a respective one of the plurality of electromagnetic induction loops” as recited in currently amended claim 13.

Crenella pertains to a two-part wireless communications system for elevator hallway fixtures in which elevator system hall fixtures are connected to a controller via wireless transceivers. Crenella column 2, lines 28-29 describe a spread-spectrum communication system performing control functions using RF communications. Although Crenella describes wireless communications, Crenella describes a controller having single antenna emitting radio waves to multiple transceivers, with each transceiver having its own antenna. As such, Crenella does not describe a plurality of peripheral devices with each peripheral device associated with one of a plurality of electromagnetic induction loops” Thus, Crenella does not disclose “each of the plurality of peripheral devices associated with a respective one of the plurality of electromagnetic induction loops” as recited in currently amended claim 13.

Menard does not provide the limitation missing from Crenella. Menard pertains to a power door control and sensor module for a wireless system. Although Menard describes long and short range wireless communication, Menard does not describe each of a plurality of devices being associated with one of a plurality of electromagnetic induction loops. As such, Menard does not disclose “each of the plurality of peripheral devices associated with a respective one of the plurality of electromagnetic induction loops” as recited in currently amended claim 13.

Myer does not provide the limitation missing from Crenella and Menard. Myer pertains to a wireless transmitter-receiver device. Although Myer discloses electromagnetic waves transmitted via a coil, Myer describes a single loop primary coil transmitting to a plurality of data storage devices. Myer does not describe multiple single loop primary coils each transmitting to a corresponding coil of one of the plurality

of data storage devices. As such, Myer does not disclose “each of the plurality of peripheral devices associated with a respective one of the plurality of electromagnetic induction loops” as recited in currently amended claim 13.

For reasons discussed above, Crenella, Menard, and Myer, separately or in combination, do not disclose each and every limitation of currently amended claim 13. New independent claims 34 and 35 contain limitations similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 13. As such, the cited references do not disclose each and every limitation of new claims 34 and 35 for reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 13. Since the cited references do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of claims 13, 34, and 35, the cited references cannot render claims 13, 34, and 35 unpatentable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and consideration and allowance of new claims 34 and 35.

For the reasons discussed above, all independent claims are allowable over the cited art. Allowance of all independent claims is requested.

All remaining dependent claims are dependent upon an allowable independent claim and are therefore also allowable.

III. No New Matter has been Added

The amendments to claim 13 do not add new matter. Support for these amendments can be found at least in Figure 3 and page 5, line 9 through page 6, line 23 of the specification as originally filed.

New claims 34 and 35 do not add new matter. Support for these claims can be found at least in Figure 3 and page 5, line 9 through page 8, line 27.

IV. Conclusion

For the reasons discussed above, all pending claims are allowable over the cited art. Reconsideration and allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

If this communication is filed after the shortened statutory time period has elapsed and no separate Petition is enclosed (or the enclosed Petition is insufficient), the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks is petitioned, under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), to extend the time for filing a response to the outstanding Office Action by the number of months which will avoid abandonment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.135. The fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17 should be charged to our Deposit Account No. 06-2143.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Joseph G. Fenske /

Joseph G. Fenske
Reg. No. 54,592
Tel.: 973-530-2128

Date: December 13, 2010
Wolff & Samson PC
One Boland Drive
West Orange, NJ 07052